

REMARKS

Claims **1-3, 5-6, 9, 11-12** and **19** have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject which I regard as my invention.

Claim **4**, was withdrawn, because it is included in other claims.

It was suggested by the Examiner at the personal interview, not to cancel the claims **7, 10, 13-18** and **20** as originally filed; I complied. This was necessary, because I am planning to file a continuation in part application.

New claims **21 - 26** were included, because in the old claims certain elements were described in the text, shown on the drawings, but were not claimed. These are not new matters!

SUMMARY OF THE INTERVIEW WITH THE EXAMINER

Again the undersigned would like to acknowledge the courtesies extended to me during the personal interview conducted with the Examiner on February 19, 2008.

At the interview I demonstrated a gynaecological instrument identified as a Vaginal delineation and occluding device. I described its structure and function. Particularly I pointed out how the telescopic legs function and how the solid ring, pivotally attached to the solid legs can be tilted to about 20° in both directions.

I demonstrated as well how the base of the vaginal delineation and occluding device can be inserted and locked into the Valtchev uterine mobilizer (U.S. Pat. No 5,445.643).

The construction of the elastic diaphragm was demonstrated, showing the thicker rim, the thicker annulus around the central hole and the thinner membrane between them. It was shown how the diaphragm is inserted into the enlarged part of the base, and when the base is inserted and locked into the head of the mobilizer, the annulus is firmly held between the head of the mobilizer and the base of the vaginal delineating and occluding device, ensuring a leak proof application. The thicker rim of the diaphragm obstructs the vagina and does not allow flow in any direction.

In the previous art described by Kohl (2,818,856) his resilient arms **22** and **24** are brought together by sliding a flange **28** forward . In my invention, as I have demonstrated to you, such movement is impossible, because my ring is solid not resilient like his.

Lipfert et al. (3,952,737) has described fingers **112**, which can be spread by pulling down the rod **120** which moves the piston **126** against the fingers **112** and moves them on their hinges and spreads them, which opens the cup. The ends of the fingers are free. In the vaginal delineation and occluding device the legs are attached at both ends and spreading is impossible.

The elastic diaphragm of the vaginal delineation and occluding device does not allow flow in any direction. Lipfert diaphragm works as a valve , permitting flow in one direction only. It is attached to the device by its periphery. The elastic diaphragm of the vaginal delineating and occluding device is attached through its hole in the center. Lipfert's diaphragm is not thicker at its periphery and its central part, like mine.

The contraceptive diaphragm which Mohajer (4,821,741) has described has a conical shape, thinner periphery and no hole, obviously different than mine.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing I believe that the amended claims, the new claims and the originally filed claims are in condition for allowance.

Favourable action with the allowance of the claims is most earnestly solicited .

March 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Konstantin L. Valtchev, M.D.

233 Beecroft Road, Suite 501

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

M2N 6Z9

Tel:416-445-4112

Fax: 416-922-3501

e-mail: kvaltchev@futureway.com